

Portland Inquirer.

THURSDAY, AUGUST 14, 1851.

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY.

The Democratic party in Maine is governed by those cardinal principles which have guided it heretofore, and up to the present time it will do so in the future, or trifling not at all. It pursues a straight-forward course in all its policy—clasping hands with no fastening—coalescing with no issues—but coexisting on the strength only of its own organization—Argo.

It would be superfluous to ask what those “cardinal principles” are, for everybody knows they are all comprised in this simple universal law: ANYTHING REQUISITED BY FAITH EXONERATES. This is the only “cardinal principle” to which any just claim can be preferred, and even to this they have no exclusive right, but hold it “commonly” with their whig neighbors.

There has so much bouting of the wisdom with which the party has been conducted in this state that it may be well to examine it a little. Being a plurality it needed no aid and only sought to retain its own strength.

The policy adopted to this end through all the earlier years of contest with slavery was to exclude intelligence from the people. Conscious of absolute inability to meet the argument of freedom they pursued the policy of French and Austrian despotism of keeping the people in ignorance, which could have been used as vigorous weapons in Europe, but no other method was left unfried to keep from the people all knowledge on the great cause of human freedom.

The whigs being a minority and needing assistance, pursued a more liberal course, but against it the “democrats” loudly protested as highly dangerous. How could the “dear people” be allowed to know the condition of their own countrymen, the policy of their own government, or be permitted to listen to arguments touching their own duties? Why, they would run crazy; fanatics would grow rank and revolution and anarchy roll over the land. No, no; “ignorance was the mother of ‘democratic’ devotion,” and the most men could not be trusted. This was not the “cardinal principle,” but cardinal policy of that party for ten years. Its representatives in congress and other officials could think now in lowest reverence—could kick the dust at the foot of the slaveholders with impunity,

“Hanging the pliant hinges of the knee
That might follow fawning.”

For illustration look over the congressional history of a Clegg, a Clifford, a Littlefield, a Clark, etc., etc.

But party tactics were inadequate to exclude all intelligence on these subjects from the party; and when the annexation of Texas was proposed the leaders saw the people would not hear it abruptly, but pursuing the “straight forward” course of the Argus, they must bend till the slave power through party exigency could so far degrade public sentiments as to make it safe to adopt the scheme. But during this period of declared absolute hostility to that nation-damning plot, the channels of party intelligence were so managed as not to render the people irresponsible, for the power would not be certain unless what the party did in the “straight forward” might require. Accordingly when the “order in Council” arrived tout-avant “Paul and Tom,” this party of “cardinal principles,” while “putting a straight forward course” came to the very acute angle of its back track, and that which had been executed became a “cardinal principle” by proclamation. The masters had trusted the leaders till apostasy became safe through what the Argus properly calls the “strength of organization.”

Afterwards came the questions of the Proviso and Free Soil, and so much intelligence had the people acquired that could not be at that time trifled with. The leaders silently mutered and cursed the ugly nags, but all must be prudently for free soil, still bemoaning the people to vote for its inerterate enemies. All through the campaign of 1848 the free soil party itself was not more for free soil than this party of “cardinal principles.” The Proviso was again and again affirmed in primary and state conventions in the legislature, the press and official papers. And even as late as 1850, the party seemed to adhere to the position of 1848, being suspicious enough that it would look very well for a party of “cardinal principles” and “straight forward policy” to make an angle of over 45 degrees offcenter than biennially. They brought forward Mr. Hubbard, a uniform and positive hunk, on local considerations, but claiming for him and for his whole family Proviso principles sufficient to secure the liberal portion of the party. Indeed the canvas was placed on that ground. We ask the people to look at a few specimens of this party of “cardinal principles” and “straight forward policy” only two years ago, and adhered to till within one year.

STATE ADDRESS.

The Great State Convention held in Portland in 1849 thus laid down the Platform of the party for “straight forward policy.”

The duty of the democracy of Maine.

“We should make a most decided demonstration in the coming gubernatorial canvass in opposition to the Slave Power.”

“The extension of slavery in territory now free,” we owe it to our country to give no countenance to, nor support any measure which would give the people of California and New Mexico, or the State governments inhabiting slavery, the democracy of Maine will consider it the imperative duty of the State to oppose and overturn the provisions of the ordinance of 1850. It is very evident that there are those within the limits of the United States, who will be satisfied with the extension of slavery, and intend to bring it into our free territories, or a dissolution of the Union.”

TEMPERANCE.

The Great State Convention held in Portland in 1849 thus laid down the Platform of the party for “straight forward policy.”

The duty of the democracy of Maine.

“We should make a most decided demonstration in the coming gubernatorial canvass in opposition to the Slave Power.”

“The extension of slavery in territory now free,” we owe it to our country to give no countenance to, nor support any measure which would give the people of California and New Mexico, or the State governments inhabiting slavery, the democracy of Maine will consider it the imperative duty of the State to oppose and overturn the provisions of the ordinance of 1850. It is very evident that there are those within the limits of the United States, who will be satisfied with the extension of slavery, and intend to bring it into our free territories, or a dissolution of the Union.”

THE ARGUS.

The Argus, speaking of this same State address, said—“We commend the publications of this important document to day. It is hoped that only with the greatest care, and that it will receive the entire sympathy of our opponents. Our friends will find it an armory from which they

may draw strong and convincing arguments, while the honest enquirer will learn the plain truth upon which the entire welfare of the nation stand. We commend upon that important document this address. It may be proper to say that the democratic free-solders who read it, what more brave fellows can there be? frank, we know where to find it. While it is true that nothing is certain if free soil principles ever succeed, it must be through the democratic party. Where, then, is the necessity of a separate organization? The baseless, jockeying democracy of its party in 1849 is always restricted.

“We trust that this address will have an extensive circulation. The democracy must give it wing.”

“We take our position upon the principles involved in this address!” “If free soil principles involved in this address?”

“We are the only ‘cardinal principle’ to which any just claim can be preferred, and even to this they have no exclusive right, but hold it in common with their whig neighbors.”

It would be superfluous to ask what those “cardinal principles” are, for everybody knows they are all comprised in this simple universal law: ANYTHING REQUISITED BY FAITH EXONERATES. This is the only “cardinal principle” to which any just claim can be preferred, and even to this they have no exclusive right, but hold it in common with their whig neighbors.

The friends of freedom oppose the compromise because it is proslavery; the secessionists, because it is not proslavery enough. Does that make them “brothers,” with the same purposes and doctrines leading to one and the same result?” Quicke doctrine that!

The Democratic party of the South, with which the Democrat is in the closest alliance of obedience, or the secession party to a very great extent; what has our contemporary to say about that? Every paper of that party in North Carolina is said to be anti-compromise.

The Democrat is also disturbed about the action of British Christians, and it might as well be with all christendom, because of their opposition to slavery. They have had the temerity to attack one of our institutions, and the editor already sees a British sympathy forming on its part. What is the editor’s opinion? “NICKERSON, however, was not satisfied with the position in favor of inhibiting slavery in all territories belonging to the United States:

1. In the resolutions of the state convention.

2. In the documents of the state convention.

3. In the resolutions of our democratic Senate and House of Representatives.

4. In the columns of the democratic press of Maine.

5. By the nomination of John Hubbard.”

On this platform the canvass proceeded and probably two thousand who left that party in ’48 were checked back in ’49 by these declarations. We may cheat for so they are now proved to have been both to the candidate and the party.

1. In the resolutions of the state convention.

2. In the documents of the state convention.

3. In the resolutions of our democratic Senate and House of Representatives.

4. In the columns of the democratic press of Maine.

5. By the nomination of John Hubbard.”

On this platform the canvass proceeded and probably two thousand who left that party in ’48 were checked back in ’49 by these declarations. We may cheat for so they are now proved to have been both to the candidate and the party.

During this period the party had become so committed in favor of Mr. Hamlin’s re-election to the Senate that he could not be set aside. Still it was strenuously resisted by the whig party, and it was decided that he should be nominated. The Free Soil party took him up and elected him, thereby saving the party which always “conquered by the strength of its own organization” from shipwreck, according to democratic tradition. Such was its boasted generalship, and such is its indebtedness to the party now treated with utmost scorn. The party of “cardinal principles” and “straight forward policy” could not and would not elect Mr. Hamlin in 1850 because, and only because he adhered to its platform, “silver” and “gold” and “free soil.”

Upon this platform the party, and the regular State Committee have now met, each by itself geographically, and after a long diplomatic negotiation, such as was to be expected, the fugitive slave bill has been agreed on.

To the people whose votes were the commodity in Northern Abolitionists, in close alliance with the aristocratic leaders of these societies, and who had given their money to the good and “upright” cause of the slaves, the party of “cardinal principles” afforded some comfort, yet the affliction at seeing “our institution” so abused is still inopportune. Hear it.

Let us examine that question. The statute of 1793 authorizes the claimant to seize or arrest the fugitive “and take him or her before any Judge of the Circuit or District Courts of the United States, residing within the State, or before any magistrate of a county, city or town corporate, wherein such seizure or arrest shall be made, for trial.”

“Upon proof to the satisfaction of such judge or magistrate either by oral testimony or affidavit taken upon oath, or by affidavit of any person seized or arrested, doth under the laws of the State or Territory from which he or she fled, or was found or liable to the person claiming him or her, or to the magistrate before whom he or she is brought, to give a certificate thereof to such claimant, his agent or attorney, which shall be sufficient warrant for removing the said fugitive to the State or Territory from which he or she fled.”

It will be seen that the statute of 1793 authorizes or professes to authorize the use of affidavits, that, etc., etc., that is, to be produced in these trials.

These affidavits might be taken in any County in the United States, before any magistrate how ever corrupt. They might be given by convicted felons, by thieves, burglars, robbers, con-festors or slave-hunters. They might be taken without any cross-examination in the robber’s case or an adulterer’s den of infamy. Still they might be used on the trial of a woman for her liberty. Not only her liberator, but at state, her master and her husband, and their wife, and her children. Such affidavits, such affidavits, up of wholesale falsehood, might certainly be purchased in abundance for one dollar a hundred, in addition to the ordinary fees of witnesses in giving, and of magistrates in taking depositions. When we consider, that such testimony might come from persons wholly incompetent to testify in suits at common law, and that such affidavits, when given by the most upright men in the community, could not be used upon a trial at common law in relation to an article of property of the value of fifty cents for want of cross-examination, we must say that it was extremely unjust if not unconstitutional. In Congress it might be acknowledged the right of every sovereign State to regulate its own municipal institutions, in such manner as it pleases, and to provide for their safety and happiness, and indirectly, by citizens of other States, or subjects of other countries:

(Precisely democratic doctrine.)

“That the wings of the State, as a body, are not to be used for carrying out any territory, the United States have few powers to impose involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime; and they rejoice that no proposition to that effect is now in view, and that it is to be rejected; while, at the same time, it is to be presented; and the real with those slaves Measures were seized was extraordinary. So long had the Argus” put forward in this way, “that party” been pursued in this way, than the course of the party, that they had discerned the strength of their hand.

Then came the consummation of the Slave Measures of Congress. Two months were granted the South to storm and fury were given to the north to fight the slaves, and the party of “cardinal principles” was born.

But party tactics were inadequate to exclude all intelligence on these subjects from the party; and when the annexation of Texas was proposed the leaders saw the people would not hear it abruptly, but pursuing the “straight forward” course of the Argus, they must bend till the slave power through party exigency could so far degrade public sentiments as to make it safe to adopt the scheme. But during this period of declared absolute hostility to that nation-damning plot, the channels of party intelligence were so managed as not to render the people irresponsible, for the power would not be certain unless what the party did in the “straight forward” might require. Accordingly when the “order in Council” arrived tout-avant “Paul and Tom,” this party of “cardinal principles,” while “putting a straight forward course” came to the very acute angle of its back track, and that which had been executed became a “cardinal principle” by proclamation. The masters had trusted the leaders till apostasy became safe through what the Argus properly calls the “strength of organization.”

Afterwards came the questions of the Proviso and Free Soil, and so much intelligence had the people acquired that could not be at that time trifled with. The leaders silently mutered and cursed the ugly nags, but all must be prudently for free soil, still bemoaning the people to vote for its inerterate enemies. All through the campaign of 1848 the free soil party itself was not more for free soil than this party of “cardinal principles.” The Proviso was again and again affirmed in primary and state conventions in the legislature, the press and official papers. And even as late as 1850, the party seemed to adhere to the position of 1848, being suspicious enough that it would look very well for a party of “cardinal principles” and “straight forward policy” to make an angle of over 45 degrees offcenter than biennially. They brought forward Mr. Hubbard, a uniform and positive hunk, on local considerations, but claiming for him and for his whole family Proviso principles sufficient to secure the liberal portion of the party. Indeed the canvas was placed on that ground. We ask the people to look at a few specimens of this party of “cardinal principles” and “straight forward policy” only two years ago, and adhered to till within one year.

Then came the consummation of the Slave Measures of Congress. Two months were granted the South to storm and fury were given to the north to fight the slaves, and the party of “cardinal principles” was born.

But party tactics were inadequate to exclude all intelligence on these subjects from the party; and when the annexation of Texas was proposed the leaders saw the people would not hear it abruptly, but pursuing the “straight forward” course of the Argus, they must bend till the slave power through party exigency could so far degrade public sentiments as to make it safe to adopt the scheme. But during this period of declared absolute hostility to that nation-damning plot, the channels of party intelligence were so managed as not to render the people irresponsible, for the power would not be certain unless what the party did in the “straight forward” might require. Accordingly when the “order in Council” arrived tout-avant “Paul and Tom,” this party of “cardinal principles,” while “putting a straight forward course” came to the very acute angle of its back track, and that which had been executed became a “cardinal principle” by proclamation. The masters had trusted the leaders till apostasy became safe through what the Argus properly calls the “strength of organization.”

Afterwards came the questions of the Proviso and Free Soil, and so much intelligence had the people acquired that could not be at that time trifled with. The leaders silently mutered and cursed the ugly nags, but all must be prudently for free soil, still bemoaning the people to vote for its inerterate enemies. All through the campaign of 1848 the free soil party itself was not more for free soil than this party of “cardinal principles.” The Proviso was again and again affirmed in primary and state conventions in the legislature, the press and official papers. And even as late as 1850, the party seemed to adhere to the position of 1848, being suspicious enough that it would look very well for a party of “cardinal principles” and “straight forward policy” to make an angle of over 45 degrees offcenter than biennially. They brought forward Mr. Hubbard, a uniform and positive hunk, on local considerations, but claiming for him and for his whole family Proviso principles sufficient to secure the liberal portion of the party. Indeed the canvas was placed on that ground. We ask the people to look at a few specimens of this party of “cardinal principles” and “straight forward policy” only two years ago, and adhered to till within one year.

Then came the consummation of the Slave Measures of Congress. Two months were granted the South to storm and fury were given to the north to fight the slaves, and the party of “cardinal principles” was born.

But party tactics were inadequate to exclude all intelligence on these subjects from the party; and when the annexation of Texas was proposed the leaders saw the people would not hear it abruptly, but pursuing the “straight forward” course of the Argus, they must bend till the slave power through party exigency could so far degrade public sentiments as to make it safe to adopt the scheme. But during this period of declared absolute hostility to that nation-damning plot, the channels of party intelligence were so managed as not to render the people irresponsible, for the power would not be certain unless what the party did in the “straight forward” might require. Accordingly when the “order in Council” arrived tout-avant “Paul and Tom,” this party of “cardinal principles,” while “putting a straight forward course” came to the very acute angle of its back track, and that which had been executed became a “cardinal principle” by proclamation. The masters had trusted the leaders till apostasy became safe through what the Argus properly calls the “strength of organization.”

Afterwards came the questions of the Proviso and Free Soil, and so much intelligence had the people acquired that could not be at that time trifled with. The leaders silently mutered and cursed the ugly nags, but all must be prudently for free soil, still bemoaning the people to vote for its inerterate enemies. All through the campaign of 1848 the free soil party itself was not more for free soil than this party of “cardinal principles.” The Proviso was again and again affirmed in primary and state conventions in the legislature, the press and official papers. And even as late as 1850, the party seemed to adhere to the position of 1848, being suspicious enough that it would look very well for a party of “cardinal principles” and “straight forward policy” to make an angle of over 45 degrees offcenter than biennially. They brought forward Mr. Hubbard, a uniform and positive hunk, on local considerations, but claiming for him and for his whole family Proviso principles sufficient to secure the liberal portion of the party. Indeed the canvas was placed on that ground. We ask the people to look at a few specimens of this party of “cardinal principles” and “straight forward policy” only two years ago, and adhered to till within one year.

Then came the consummation of the Slave Measures of Congress. Two months were granted the South to storm and fury were given to the north to fight the slaves, and the party of “cardinal principles” was born.

But party tactics were inadequate to exclude all intelligence on these subjects from the party; and when the annexation of Texas was proposed the leaders saw the people would not hear it abruptly, but pursuing the “straight forward” course of the Argus, they must bend till the slave power through party exigency could so far degrade public sentiments as to make it safe to adopt the scheme. But during this period of declared absolute hostility to that nation-damning plot, the channels of party intelligence were so managed as not to render the people irresponsible, for the power would not be certain unless what the party did in the “straight forward” might require. Accordingly when the “order in Council” arrived tout-avant “Paul and Tom,” this party of “cardinal principles,” while “putting a straight forward course” came to the very acute angle of its back track, and that which had been executed became a “cardinal principle” by proclamation. The masters had trusted the leaders till apostasy became safe through what the Argus properly calls the “strength of organization.”

Afterwards came the questions of the Proviso and Free Soil, and so much intelligence had the people acquired that could not be at that time trifled with. The leaders silently mutered and cursed the ugly nags, but all must be prudently for free soil, still bemoaning the people to vote for its inerterate enemies. All through the campaign of 1848 the free soil party itself was not more for free soil than this party of “cardinal principles.” The Proviso was again and again affirmed in primary and state conventions in the legislature, the press and official papers. And even as late as 1850, the party seemed to adhere to the position of 1848, being suspicious enough that it would look very well for a party of “cardinal principles” and “straight forward policy” to make an angle of over 45 degrees offcenter than biennially. They brought forward Mr. Hubbard, a uniform and positive hunk, on local considerations, but claiming for him and for his whole family Proviso principles sufficient to secure the liberal portion of the party. Indeed the canvas was placed on that ground. We ask the people to look at a few specimens of this party of “cardinal principles” and “straight forward policy” only two years ago, and adhered to till within one year.

Then came the consummation of the Slave Measures of Congress. Two months were granted the South to storm and fury were given to the north to fight the slaves, and the party of “cardinal principles” was born.

But party tactics were inadequate to exclude all intelligence on these subjects from the party; and when the annexation of Texas was proposed the leaders saw the people would not hear it abruptly, but pursuing the “straight forward” course of the Argus, they must bend till the slave power through party exigency could so far degrade public sentiments as to make it safe to adopt the scheme. But during this period of declared absolute hostility to that nation-damning plot, the channels of party intelligence were so managed as not to render the people irresponsible, for the power would not be certain unless what the party did in the “straight forward” might require. Accordingly when the “order in Council” arrived tout-avant “Paul and Tom,” this party of “cardinal principles,” while “putting a straight forward course” came to the very acute angle of its back track, and that which had been executed became a “cardinal principle” by proclamation. The masters had trusted the leaders till apostasy became safe through what the Argus properly calls the “strength of organization.”

Afterwards came the questions of the Proviso and Free Soil, and so much intelligence had the people acquired that could not be at that time trifled with. The leaders silently mutered and cursed the ugly nags, but all must be prudently for free soil, still bemoaning the people to vote for its inerterate enemies. All through the campaign of 1848 the free soil party itself was not more for free soil than this party of “cardinal principles.” The Proviso was again and again affirmed in primary and state conventions in the legislature, the press and official papers. And even as late as 1850, the party seemed to adhere to the position of 1848, being suspicious enough that it would look very well for a party of “cardinal principles” and “straight forward policy” to make an angle of over 45 degrees offcenter than biennially. They brought forward Mr. Hubbard, a uniform and positive hunk, on local considerations, but claiming for him and for his whole family Proviso principles sufficient to secure the liberal portion of the party. Indeed the canvas was placed on that ground. We ask the people to look at a few specimens of this party of “cardinal principles” and “straight forward policy” only two years ago, and adhered to till within one year.

Then came the consummation of the Slave Measures of Congress. Two months were granted the South to storm and fury were given to the north to fight the slaves, and the party of “cardinal principles” was born.

But party tactics were inadequate to exclude all intelligence on these subjects from the party; and when the annexation of Texas was proposed the leaders saw the people would not hear it abruptly, but pursuing the “straight forward” course of the Argus, they must bend till the slave power through party exigency could so far degrade public sentiments as to make it safe to adopt the scheme. But during this period of declared absolute hostility to that nation-damning plot, the channels of party intelligence were so managed as not to render the people irresponsible, for the power would not be certain unless what the party did in the “straight forward” might require. Accordingly when the “order in Council” arrived tout-avant “Paul and Tom,” this party of “cardinal principles,” while “putting a straight forward course” came to the very acute angle of its back track, and that which had been executed became a “cardinal principle” by proclamation. The masters had trusted the leaders till apostasy became safe through what the Argus properly calls the “strength of organization.”

Afterwards came the questions of the Proviso and Free Soil, and so much intelligence had the people acquired that could not be at that time trifled with. The leaders silently mutered and cursed the ugly nags, but all must be prudently for free soil, still bemoaning the people to vote for its inerterate enemies. All through the campaign of 1848 the free soil party itself was not more for free soil than this party of “cardinal principles.” The Proviso was again and again affirmed in primary and state conventions in the legislature, the press and official papers. And even as late as 1850, the party seemed to adhere to the position of 1848, being suspicious enough that it would look very well for a party of “cardinal principles” and “straight forward policy” to make an angle of over 45 degrees offcenter than biennially. They brought forward Mr. Hubbard, a uniform and positive hunk, on local considerations, but claiming for him and for his whole family Proviso principles sufficient to secure the liberal portion of the party. Indeed the canvas was placed on that ground. We ask the people to look at a few specimens of this party of “cardinal principles” and “straight forward policy” only two years ago, and adhered to till within one year.

Then came the consummation of the Slave Measures of Congress. Two months were granted the South to storm and fury were given to the north to fight the slaves, and the party of “cardinal principles” was born.

But party tactics were inadequate to exclude all intelligence on these subjects from the party; and when the annexation of Texas was proposed the leaders saw the people would not hear it abruptly, but pursuing the “straight forward” course of the Argus, they must bend till the slave power through party exigency could so far degrade public sentiments as to make it safe to adopt the scheme. But during this period of declared absolute hostility to that nation-damning plot, the channels of party intelligence were so managed as not to render the people irresponsible, for the power would not be certain unless what the party did in the “straight forward” might require. Accordingly when the “order in Council” arrived tout-avant “Paul and Tom,” this party of “cardinal principles,” while “putting a straight forward course” came to the very acute angle of its back track, and that which had been executed became a “cardinal principle” by proclamation. The masters had trusted the leaders till apostasy became safe through what the Argus properly calls the “strength of organization.”

Afterwards came the questions of the Proviso and Free Soil, and so much intelligence had the people acquired that could not be at that time trifled with. The leaders silently mutered and cursed the ugly nags, but all must be prudently for free soil, still bemoaning the people to vote for its inerterate enemies. All through the campaign of 1848 the free soil party itself was not more for free soil than this party of “cardinal principles.” The Proviso was again and again affirmed in primary and state conventions in the legislature, the press and official papers. And even as late as 1850, the party seemed to adhere to the position of 1848, being suspicious enough that it would look very well for a party of “cardinal principles” and “straight forward policy” to make an angle of over 45 degrees offcenter than biennially. They brought forward Mr. Hubbard, a uniform and positive hunk, on local considerations, but claiming for him and for his whole family Proviso principles sufficient to secure the liberal portion of the party. Indeed the canvas was placed on that ground. We ask the people to look at a few specimens of this party of “cardinal principles” and “straight forward policy” only two years ago, and adhered to till within one year.

Then came the consummation of the Slave Measures of Congress. Two months were granted the South to storm and fury were given to the north to fight the slaves, and the party of “cardinal principles” was born.

But party tactics were inadequate to exclude all intelligence on these subjects from the party; and when the annexation of Texas was proposed the leaders saw the people would not hear it abruptly, but pursuing the “straight forward” course of the Argus, they must bend till the slave power through party exigency could so far degrade public sentiments as to make it safe to adopt the scheme. But during this period of declared absolute hostility to that nation-damning plot, the channels of party intelligence were so managed as not to render the people irresponsible, for the power would not be certain unless what the party did in the “straight forward” might require. Accordingly when the “order in Council” arrived tout-avant “Paul and Tom,” this party of “cardinal principles,” while “putting a straight forward course” came to the very acute angle of its back track, and that which had been executed became a “cardinal principle” by proclamation. The masters had trusted the leaders till apostasy became safe through what the Argus properly calls the “strength of organization.”

Afterwards came the questions of the Proviso and Free Soil, and so much intelligence had the people acquired that could not be at that time trifled with. The leaders silently mutered and cursed the ugly nags, but all must be prudently for free soil, still bemoaning the people to vote for its inerterate enemies. All through the campaign of 1848 the free soil party itself was not more for free soil than this party of “cardinal principles.” The Proviso was again and again affirmed in primary and state conventions in the legislature, the press and official papers. And even as late as 1850, the party seemed to adhere to the position of 1848, being suspicious enough that it would look very well for a party of “cardinal principles” and “straight forward policy” to make an angle of over 45 degrees offcenter than biennially. They brought forward Mr. Hubbard, a uniform and positive hunk, on local considerations, but claiming for him and for his whole family Proviso principles sufficient to secure the liberal portion of the party. Indeed the canvas was placed on that ground. We ask the people to look at a few specimens of this party of “cardinal principles” and “straight forward policy” only two years ago, and adhered to till within one year.

Then came the consummation of the Slave Measures of Congress. Two months were granted the South to storm and fury were given to the north to fight the slaves, and the party of “cardinal principles” was born.

But party tactics were inadequate to exclude all intelligence on these subjects from the party; and when the annexation of Texas was proposed the leaders saw the people would not hear it abruptly, but pursuing the “straight forward” course of the Argus, they must bend till the slave power through party exigency could so far degrade public sentiments as to make it safe to adopt the scheme. But during this period of declared absolute hostility to that nation-damning plot, the channels of party intelligence were so managed as not to render the people irresponsible, for the power would not be certain unless what the party did in the “straight forward” might require. Accordingly when the “order in Council” arrived tout-avant “Paul and Tom,” this party of “cardinal principles,” while “putting a straight forward course” came to the very acute angle of its back track, and that which had been executed became a “cardinal principle” by proclamation. The masters had trusted the leaders till apostasy became safe through what the Argus properly calls the “strength of organization.”

Afterwards came the questions of the Proviso and Free Soil, and so much intelligence had the people acquired that could not be at that time trifled with. The leaders silently mutered and cursed the ugly nags, but all must be prudently for free soil, still bemoaning the people to vote for its inerterate enemies. All through the campaign of 1848 the free soil party itself was not more for free soil than this party of “cardinal principles.” The Proviso was again and again affirmed in primary and state conventions in the legislature, the press and official papers. And even as late as 1850, the party seemed to adhere to the position of 1848, being suspicious enough that it would look very well for a party of “cardinal principles” and “straight forward policy” to make an angle of over 45 degrees offcenter than biennially. They brought forward Mr. Hubbard, a uniform and positive hunk, on local considerations, but claiming for him and for his whole family Proviso principles sufficient to secure the liberal portion of the party. Indeed the canvas was placed on that ground. We ask the people to look at a few specimens of this party of “cardinal principles” and “straight forward policy” only two years ago, and adhered to till within one year.

Then came the consummation of the Slave Measures of Congress. Two months were granted the South to storm and fury were given to the north to fight the slaves, and the party of “cardinal principles” was born.

But party tactics were inadequate to exclude all intelligence on these subjects from the party; and when the annexation of Texas was proposed the leaders saw the people would not hear it abruptly, but pursuing the “straight forward” course of the Argus, they must bend till the slave power through party exigency could so far degrade public sentiments as to make it safe to adopt the scheme. But during this period of declared absolute hostility to that nation-damning plot, the channels of party intelligence were so managed as not to render the people irresponsible, for the power would not be certain unless what the party did in the “straight forward” might require. Accordingly when the “order in Council” arrived tout-avant “Paul and Tom,” this party of “cardinal principles,” while “putting a straight forward course” came to the very acute angle of its back track, and that which had been executed became a “cardinal principle” by proclamation. The masters had trusted the leaders till apostasy became safe through what the Argus properly calls the “strength of organization.”

Afterwards came the questions of the Proviso and Free Soil, and so much intelligence had the people acquired that could not be at that time trifled with. The leaders silently mutered and cursed the ugly nags, but all must be prudently for free soil, still bemoaning the people to vote for its inerterate enemies. All through the campaign of 1848 the free soil party itself was not more for free soil than this party of “cardinal principles.” The Proviso was again and again affirmed in primary and state conventions in the legislature, the press and official papers. And even as late as 1850, the party seemed to adhere to the position of 18

WESTERN TOUR.

Bros. Wiley.—The Christian Anti-Slavery Convention held at Chicago, Illinois, on the 4th, and 5th of July, was large, interesting and profitable. About two hundred and fifty delegates were present from thirteen States; and I am not able to say from how many sections of the church. There were Presbyterians, Baptists, Methodists, Congregationalists, and some others. The audience was also large. Some of the strongest men, many of the earnest, philanthropic, whole-hearted, devoted men of the West were present. The scenes of devotion, of which we had many, were truly sublime. Among the topics discussed, were the relations of the church to slavery in her missionary operations, domestic and foreign, in her fellowship and communion, in her religious literature, &c. These subjects involve the vital interests of the kingdom of Christ. They were submitted to committees, who reported on them. These reports were then taken up and freely discussed by the Convention. Opportunity was given for any remarks to be made touching the subjects under consideration. A resolution was manifested by the Convention to make full credit for all, which were benevolent. Associations had done to enlighten the ignorant, to reform the wicked, and to save the lost. The proceedings were not a trifle against the ecclesiastical and religious organizations of the country. You know that I am somewhat sensitive on this point. Often have I rebuked the harsh, uncalled-for, bitter and denunciatory language sometimes employed. Yet never have I heard or read, expressions so censorious or withering, as proceeded from Him, who is full of love; and is a perfect pattern of all which is meek and lowly in his whole demeanor. That these were unkind things, no expressions uttered in violation of the law of love I would not say. But this is to say, that the reasoning and remarks on the various topics were sound, logical, scriptural, and in a good manner, corresponding to the New York Evangelist's style, the members of the Convention "disorganized," and say, "It is their avowed purpose to divide and destroy all the larger religious denominations in the land." I certainly heard no such purpose avowed, nor any desire expressed for such an event. There was a fervent desire manifested, that all our benevolent societies, as well as the churches, might wholly withdraw themselves from the shameful, abominable, wicked system of slaveholding in these U. S., and that they would renounce their concentrated, mighty influence for its total and speedy removal. That some of our Societies and some of our churches are not doing this is undeniable. The convention did labor heartily to have all the churches take such a stand and persevere such a course in regard to this crying sin of the gospel requires. The Convention believed that the churches should set themselves openly and decidedly against every form of acknowledged sin. Slaveholding is right one is the most pernicious heresies, which a man can embrace.

But to return to the Convention. The Prairie Herald which we are told does not at all sympathize with the doings of this Convention gives the following testimony to its character and spirit: "In respect to ability-speaking ability we have seen few gatherings equal to this. The number of forcible, effective punctanglers was large and tho' a great portion of time seemed to be spent in talking over and debating side issues, and often in trivial ones, yet there was a great deal of excellent speaking."

The general spirit of the meeting too was harmonious and dignified. The prayer meetings were among the best of their kind; and the singing was often such as was calculated to move every energy of the soul. In short there was every indication of men in thorough earnest, believing themselves engaged in God's work.

The first resolution adopted was, "That this is designed to be a Christian Convention, in spirit and action, and should be conducted as a religious convocation, attending to the business of the Redeemer's Kingdom."

Other resolutions were adopted, but not being able to present the reasons by which they were sustained, I would ask the readers of the Inquirer to wait patiently for a season till an official report of the proceedings shall be published. This may be expected ere long in the Anti-Slavery Missionary, and in a pamphlet.

From the same goes further, "the correspondence of the Evangelists from other sources, very uncandid and unjust representation of the doings of that meeting have gone forth. All we ask is to have our positions, reasoning, and doing fairly weighed in the balance of the sanctuary. If they are found wanting in truth and righteousness, let it appear."

Twenty WINTER MOUNTAIN STATION HOUSES.—Liquor. We noticed, a few weeks since, the absence house and are not sorry we did so. We are satisfied the house, location, conveniences and attention are all that any reasonable traveler could desire. But we feel constrained to say that the means of making men beastly has been exercised to such an extent as to greatly offend us both, both in traveling, and unless the evil is removed, the premises will destroy the reputation of the establishment, which otherwise might be a praiseworthy and credit to all concerned. We feel satisfied the great majority of stock-holders are desirous the house should be of such a character that all may continue their pecuniary interest and feel they sacrifice no principle in doing so. We are also satisfied the directors are men of good judgment, and see at a glance the importance of managing the affairs of the house so as not to impair confidence in the general conduct of the road.

We learn with pleasure, that the architect and master builder of the house, Mr. Beale, who is a director of the Atlantic and St. Lawrence Railroad Company did not allow any spirits to be sold by those engaged in building, and that he did not meet the hearty approval of the whole board; therefore, we conclude there need be no fear but that we so restrict any immoral tendencies, in the present arrangement of the houses. It gives us great pleasure to refer to the President, at the annual meeting, concerning the passage of the resolution requesting the directors to restrict the sale of intoxicating liquors in the house at Gorham, N. H. It shows how fully he concurred in this spirit of the resolution, as it generally exists, in the wise management of the affairs of the road. Mr. Little has exhibited his good judgment and foresight with reference to building this house, and we should not be afraid to risk his judgement in the matter of its conduct in respect to its character for temperance and sobriety.

ROBERT.—We understand that Capt. G. P. Piero, who returned home in the Empire City, after a prolonged absence in California, found upon reaching the steamer upon this side of the latitudes, that his trunk was missing, containing between \$2,000 and \$3,000 in gold.

CONSPIRACY IN CALIFORNIA.—

A California correspondent of the *Advertiser* gives the following account of the efforts and prospects of the Slave-extortionists in California:

"Slave-extortionists are plotting secretly. Their open policy is to get the State to pass a law that will prohibit them from carrying their slaves across the state line. They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

They are to do this by getting a bill introduced in the Legislature, and if passed, will be a *law* in the State."

</div

